

REMARKS

The Examiner's continued attention to the present application is noted with appreciation.

In the Examiner's initial comments in the Office Action, the Examiner noted that "external fixed structure" is very vague, and used the example of such a structure or device being an air compressor or audio system. Since this is not the intent of the present invention, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 46 to more clearly recite the present invention. The external fixed structure is "a fixed, external home, business or other building structure." Applicant's invention provides portable power to such building structures, for instance those in a remote location that are not on a power grid.

Also in these initial comments, the Examiner noted that functional language was used. Presumably, this comment is only applicable to claim 1 as claim 46 is a method claim. In any event, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the structure is a "fixed, external home, business or other building structure." This is relevant in that the Examiner has attempted to combine references that do not meet these limitations (e.g. a car with a solar panel (Limonius), rather than a fixed building structure).

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, 13-15, 19, 46, 48-49, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being obvious based on US 4261329 (Walsh et al) in view of US 2002/0153178 (Limonius); further rejected claims 1, 4-8, 13-19, 45-46, 48-49, 51, 56 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious based on US 4553037 (Veazey) in view of US 4261329 (Walsh et al) and US 2002/0153178 (Limonius); and further rejected claims 17-18, 36, 54, 57 and 59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 4553037 (Veazey) in view of Walsh et al and Limonius, and US 2003/0054329 (Springett).

The references cited by the Examiner do not disclose or render obvious the limitation of solar panels automatically tracking the sun as the sun moves. This is the subject matter of previous dependent claim 7, which has now been added to both independent claims 1 and 46.

Veazey shows a combination wind turbine above a solar panel. The Veazey solar panel could not automatically move to track the sun because it is underneath the wind turbine. Veazey also fails to disclose the back-up generator, the fuel storage container and the batteries on its platform as recited in Applicant's independent claims.

Walsh, et al. shows fixed solar panels on a trailer. Walsh, et al. fails to disclose tracking solar panels, a back-up-generator, a fuel storage container and the batteries on the trailer, as recited by

Applicant. The Walsh, et al. solar panels are not automatic sun tracking panels.

Limonius is an electric car with a solar panel on the roof. It has a generator and a fuel-storage container. However, Limonius fails to disclose a tracking solar panel and does not power a fixed building structure, such as a home office or other building structure.

Springett is a portable computer classroom (a self-contained bus). It is a standard bus (e.g. city bus), that has been customized to include a satellite dish. However, Springett completely fails to include even a solar panel. The Examiner has combined a completely inapplicable reference just to show a satellite dish. My home has a satellite dish, but this is equally inapplicable.

It would not be obvious for one skilled in the art to combine an electric car (Limonius) with a solar breeze power package and saucer ship (Veazey), a fixed panel trailer system (Walsh, et al.) and a classroom bus with a satellite dish (Springett). Even if one were to combine all these references cited by the Examiner, it would not result in Applicant's invention. Applicant's invention is all comprehensive in that it has a renewable energy source, a back-up energy source, and power storage (batteries). It is connected to a fixed building structure, such as a home, office or other external building structure. In alternative embodiments, it also has wind power and communications, all of which can be transported on the platform for providing energy and communications to a fixed, external building structure.

Likewise, the references cited by the Examiner further fail to disclose the following dependent claims:

New claim 60 recites that the energy generated is sufficient to completely power the external building structure on a daily basis.

Applicant's claims 8, 51 and 58 recite a wind power system, in combination with a solar tracking system, generator and batteries.


Claims 17, 54 and 57 recite a communications system in combination with all the other limitations.

Because the references cited and combined by the Examiner are so different and because Applicant's invention is truly a comprehensive power system for an external building structure, it is believed that the claims, as amended, are allowable over these references, alone or in combination.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection have been traversed. It is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance and same is respectfully requested.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner believes that prosecution of this application might be expedited by discussion of the issues, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Deborah A. Peacock', written over a horizontal line.

Deborah A. Peacock, Reg. No. 31,649
Direct Line: (505) 998-1501

PEACOCK MYERS, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant
P.O. Box 26927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927
Telephone: (505) 998-1500
Facsimile: (505) 243-2542

Customer No. 005179

G:\A-CLIENTS\Sacred Power\PAT\10-725671\671 - RCE QA(1) 032408.doc